This is the best of the proposals, but I feel it could be made better with a few small changes. The important feature the FCC should attempt to incorporate into any new structure, is an incentive for all license classes to encourage advancement to the higher levels of amateur radio. Making a new class license that allows the newcomer to stagnate at the 'beginners' level will do nothing to improve the Amateur Radio Service

As for RM-10868 by the RAF, I would suggest these minor changes

- 1 . I believe a new 'beginners' class license as proposed by the ARRL (RM 10867) is needed.
- 2. The new license class should include a time limit one or two years, non renewable. Just like the old novice did in the 1950's a d1960's, then there is an incentive to grow and become knowledgeable about amateur radio.
- 3. Leave the General Class intact, with the 5 WPM CW test, The idea that CW discourages the 'best of the best' from entering into amateur radio is nonsense.
- 5. Leave the Extra class as is, but add the requirement, any extra class must have been a General class for two years, and be able to prove activity on the HF bands, via logs or QSL cards. Make the Extra something to work for, be proud of.
- 6. I am NOT in favor of upgrading the present Technician class licenses to General class WITHOUT taking the General examination. They should eihter satisfy the code and examination requirements for the General Class, or fall back to the beginner class (which would still be a gain in privileges) after a specific period of time
- 7. What to do with the present Novices? Give them 1 or 2 years to get in and upgrade to General or they fall back to beginner. As for the Advanced Class, I see no reason not to move them up to Extra. The FCC shouldn't carry (forever) , license classes that no longer exist.

8. Otherwise I am in general agreement with RM-10868.

Sincerely Yours,

Steve Kearny KW7N

```
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2><FONT face=3D"Times New Roman"</pre>
size=3D3> </FONT>
<P>&lt;PROCEEDING&qt;&nbsp; RM-10868 <BR>&lt;DATE&qt;&nbsp; 04/14/2004
<BR>&lt;NAME&qt;&nbsp; Steve Kearny<BR>&lt;ADDRESS1&qt;&nbsp; 874
Sawgrass
Circle                 
               
     
               
     
               
     
               
     
               
     
               
     
               
     
    <ADDRESS2&gt; <BR>&lt;CITY&gt;&nbsp;
Pocatello                 
     
               
     
               
     
               
     
               
     
               
     
               
     
               
     
               
     
               
   
     
<STATE&qt;&nbsp;ID&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp;&nbsp
p;                            
;                      
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        &n
nbsp;                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       &nb
bsp;                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       &nbs
sp;                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       &nbsp
p;                       &nbsp
;                      
                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        &n
nbsp;                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       &nb
```

bsp; &nbs

; anbsp; nbsp; &nb bsp; &nbs sp; <ZIP&qt;&nbsp; 83204 <BR>&lt;LAW-FIRM&qt; <BR>&lt;ATTORNEY&qt; <BR>&lt;FILE-NUMBER&qt; <BR>&lt;DOCUMENT-TYPE&qt;co <BR>&lt;PHONE-NUMBER&gt;2&nbsp; 08-234-7429 <BR>&lt;DESCRIPTION&gt;Comment <BR>&lt;CONTACT-EMAIL&gt;&nbsp; <A</pre> href=3D"mailto:sjkearny@cableone.net">sjkearny@cableone.net</A> <BR>&lt;TEXT&qt; <P>&nbsp;</P> <P>This is the best of the proposals, but I feel it could be made better with a few small changes. The important feature the FCC should attempt to incorporate into any new structure, is an incentive for all license classes to encourage advancement to the higher levels of amateur radio. Making@nbsp; a new class license that allows the newcomer to stagnate at 'beginners' level will do nothing to improve the Amateur Radio Service </P> <P>As for RM-10868 by the RAF, &nbsp; I would suggest these minor changes <P>1 . I believe a new 'beginners' class license as proposed by the ARRL (RM 10867) is needed. <BR>2.&nbsp; The new license class should include a time limit one or two years, non renewable. Just like the old novice did in the 1950's a d1960's, then there is an incentive to grow and become knowledgeable about amateur radio. <BR>3. Leave the General Class intact, with the 5 WPM CW test, The idea that CW discourages the 'best of the best' from entering into amateur radio is nonsense. <BR>5. Leave the Extra class as is, but add requirement, any extra class must have been a General class for two years, and be able to prove activity on the HF bands, via logs or QSL cards. Make the Extra something to work for, be proud of. <BR>6. I am NOT in favor of upgrading the present Technician class licenses to General class WITHOUT taking the General examination. They should eihter satisfy the code and examination requirements for the General Class, or fall back to the beginner class (which would still be a gain in privileges) after a specific period of time <BR>7. What to do with the present Novices? Give

them 1 or 2 years to get in and upgrade to General or they fall back to beginner. nbsp; As for the Advanced Class, I see no reason not to move them up

to Extra. The FCC shouldn't carry (forever) , license classes that no

longer exist.  $\langle BR \rangle 8$ . Otherwise I am in general agreement with  $\ RM-10868$ .

<P>. <BR>&nbsp; <P>Sincerely Yours,</P> <P>Steve Kearny&nbsp; KW7N&nbsp;<BR>&nbsp; <BR></P></FONT></DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----\_NextPart\_000\_0064\_01C42254.CDC39240--